

Draft: September 19, 2002

**Notes from
Needs Breakout Session
Red River Valley Water Supply Project
Technical Team Meeting – September 10, 2002**

Breakout Session Attendees:

NAME	ORGANIZATION / PHONE #	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Dave Koland	Garrison Diversion Conservancy District 701.652.3194	
Karl Wirkus	Bureau of Reclamation 406.247.7600	kwirkus@gp.usbr.gov
Ed Cryer	Montgomery Watson – GDCD consultant 208.345.5863	edwin.cryer@mw.com
Joe Engeln	Missouri Department of Natural Resources 573.751.9813	nrengej@mail.dnr.state.mo.us
David Bruschwein	ND State Health Department 701.328.5259	dbruschw@state.nd.us
Pat Fridgen	ND State Water Commission 701.328.2752	pfridgen@water.swc.state.nd.us
Jeffrey Mattern	ND State Water Commission 701.328.2473	jmatter@water.swc.state.nd.us
Darrin Goetzfried	Bureau of Reclamation 701.250.4242	dgoetzfried@gp.usbr.gov
Niel Stessman	National Audubon Society volunteer 406.248.5868	nstessman@aol.com
Gene Reetz	US Environmental Protection Agency 303.312.6550	reetz.gene@epa.gov
Steve Burian	Eastern Dakota Water Users 701.746.8087	steve.burian@advenginc.com
Rick St. Germain	Houston Engineering – GDCD consultant 701.237.5065	rick@houstonengineeringinc.com
Tim Keller	Bureau of Reclamation 701.250.4242	tkeller@gp.usbr.gov
Alicia Waters	Bureau of Reclamation 701.250.4242	awaters@gp.usbr.gov
Jeff Lewis	Minnesota Pollution Control Agency 218.846.0730	jeff.lewis@pca.state.mn.us
Maria Effertz-Hanson	Garrison Diversion Conservancy District 701.652.3194	maria@daktel.com
Mark Bittner	City of Fargo 701.241.1545	mhbittner@ci.fargo.nd.us
Paul Summers	Garrison Diversion Conservancy District 701.652.3194	
Jon Lindgren	Garrison Diversion Conservancy District	

Session Facilitator: Dean Karsky

Opening Remarks: Dean Karsky noted that an agenda had been prepared for the breakout session that covered two main topics: needs assessment tasks that had changed in the last year and tasks to be started in the near future. These topics were briefly discussed in the Technical Team (TT) meeting.

- 1. Water use data collection and should the detail of the data be different depending on the size of the community?** Dean Karsky noted that the Needs SPOS currently includes different data collection requirements depending on the size of the community. More detailed data would be collected for communities serving over 500, as compared to communities serving fewer than 500. There are approximately 130 public water systems in the Red River Valley in ND (# includes 3 Minnesota towns along Red River), half (65) have a population under 500. Half (32) of the towns under 500 population are currently served by rural water systems while the other half (33) have their own groundwater systems. Reclamation is interested in what TT members thought of this approach. D. Karsky also noted that in the earlier Reclamation studies only communities with a population over 5,000 were analyzed along with all of the rural water systems.

Comments:

- a. We need to look at smaller communities because their water needs could be less in the future (Neil Stessman).
- b. It is safe to assume that all of the 33 towns on their own groundwater system will be served by a rural water system in the next 50 to 75 years (Steve Burian).
- c. The process of smaller water systems being served by larger systems is also happening in Missouri (Joe Engeln).
- d. Water quality and Safe Drinking Water Act regulations may drive smaller communities to be served by larger water systems. Don't limit the Needs Assessment because smaller communities don't realize they may have future needs (Mark Bittner).
- e. Most communities plan for water needs 5 – 10 years in the future. 50 years in the future is very difficult (Ed Cryer).
- f. Reclamation will not ignore the 33 smaller communities (Tim Keller).
- g. Many smaller communities have adequate capacity with their present groundwater permits, but rural water systems will have problems in the future (S. Burian).
- h. We need to look for opportunities to optimize water use after water user meetings (N. Stessman).
- i. If representatives from smaller water systems don't attend the upcoming water user meetings Reclamation should consider follow-up phone calls or data from State Water Commission (Jeffrey Mattern).
- j. May need to identify communities that have needs prior to completing this project to focus resources there first (J. Engeln).

- 2. Population Projections – How are population projections dealt with in the Needs Assessment (Gene Reetz)?** Reclamation conducted one population projection in the Phase II study and study participants also provided their population projections. Generally, the rural population is decreasing and the urban population is increasing. The Needs SPOS includes multiple population projections to determine a range (T. Keller and D. Karsky).

Comments:

 - a. Need to be aware of the dynamics of how population change is occurring. For example, not all of Fargo growth is related to rural folks moving into town (S. Burian).
 - b. Fargo has possibly done some detailed demographic work on population growth that would be useful in the population analysis (M. Bittner).
 - c. Demographers are seeing a new trend where first generation immigrants moved into larger cities, but second generations are now moving out to other areas (J. Engeln).
 - d. A 50 year time frame is very difficult to accurately predict. Projections are usually less than what actually occurs. (E. Cryer).
- 3. Question about why a 50 year timeframe (year 2050) is used in the Needs Assessment (N. Stessman).** Reclamation used the year 2050 as a planning date for two reasons; the typical repayment period for this type of project is 40 years, and the expected useful life of the facilities is about that same time frame (T. Keller).
- 4. Discussion about conversion of water use from one type to another.**

 - a. Water resource use is being converted from agriculture to municipal in many areas of the county because of limited availability of new water sources.
 - b. People have started to purchase water rights in some states (Texas and Colorado – given as examples) and are speculating on its potential value in the future (E. Cryer).
- 5. Question about whether some standardization of MR&I data collection will be developed (S. Burian).** Reclamation will develop a standard form based on the types of data identified in the Needs SPOS (D. Karsky).
- 6. Question about how the different SPOSs inter-relate, such as the water conservation work (G. Reetz).** The water conservation work will actually be done under the Engineering SPOS, but the results will be used in the Needs Assessment when estimating future water demands (D. Karsky).
- 7. Additional Comment.** The No-Action Alternative will involve some water system work (construction) by communities even if there is no Red River Valley Project. This water system work will need to be estimated and included in the No-Action Alternative so all of the alternatives can be evaluated equally (Darrin Goetzfried).

Draft: September 19, 2002

Closing Comments (D. Karsky):

- Comments on the Needs SPOS are due by September 27. Comments should be e-mailed to Signe Snortland at ssnortland@gp.usbr.gov.
- Water user meetings will be held during the week of October 7th. We have tentatively scheduled the meetings for Fargo, Wahpeton, Lisbon, Valley City, Hillsboro, Grand Forks, Langdon, and Grafton. A more detailed schedule will be provided to the TT.
- Purpose of water user meetings includes:
 - Basic presentation on Reclamation studies to-date
 - How water users can participate in study process, including data collection
 - Water system assessments for some communities
 - Overall study timetable

Action Items:

- Dean Karsky will send Technical and Study Review teams a list of the water user meeting dates, times, and locations.